

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
17 April 1968

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>	
1. Dates of Next Meeting	1
2. Approval of Minutes of February 1968 Meeting	1
3. Joint NCPC-CFA Committee on Landmarks	1
<u>LEGISLATION</u>	
1. S. 2970	1-2
2. H.R. 15859	2
<u>SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS</u>	
1. <u>Redevelopment Land Agency</u>	
a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in S.W. Washington, Maryland Ave. between 6th and 7th Sts.	2
b. Proposed Building Across Maryland Ave. Railroad Tracks, Southwest	3
c. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building	3
2. <u>General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc</u>	
a. Child Research Center, National Institutes of Health- Proposed Design, Johannes & Murray, architects.	3
b. Howard University Teaching Hospital	3-4
3. <u>D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds</u>	
Capitol East Playground and Natatorium	4
4. <u>Department of the Interior, National Park Service</u>	
Proposed Ellipse Fountains at Constitution Avenue and 16th St., N.W.	4
5. <u>D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic</u>	
Center Leg of Inner Loop, Design of South Portal and Walls	4-5

6.	<u>Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers</u>	
	Guard Houses, Arlington National Cemetery	5
7.	<u>D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections</u>	
	<u>Old Georgetown Act</u>	
a.	Appendix 2	5
b.	O.G. 68-170, 3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W.-Heating and Cooling Plant, Georgetown University	5-6
c.	Rehabilitation of Old Warehouse, 1054-31st St., N.W.	6
	<u>SHIPStead-Luce Act</u>	
a.	Appendix 1	6
b.	S.W. Communications Center, South Capitol and E Sts., S.W.	6
c.	American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building	6

INTERVIEWS

1.	<u>D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections</u>	
	American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building	7
2.	<u>D.C. Government, Redevelopment Land Agency</u>	
a.	Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in S.W. Washington	7-8
b.	Proposed Building Across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks	8
c.	L'Enfant Plaza, West Building	8-9
3.	<u>General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc</u>	
a.	Child Research Center, NIH	9
b.	Howard University Teaching Hospital	9

4. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic
Center Leg of Inner Loop, Design of South Portal and Walls 9
5. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds
Capitol East Playground and Natatorium 9
6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Southwest Communications Center-Revised Design 10

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 17 April 1968. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session 9:48 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
Chloethiel Woodard Smith

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secy
Donald B. Myer,
Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Re-
search Analyst
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: David MacKinnon

Leone Vialpando

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting

Tuesday-Wednesday, 14-15 May 1968 were approved.

2. Approval of Minutes of February 1968 Meeting

Approved Unanimously.

3. Joint NCPC-CFA Committee on Landmarks - Confirmation of Previous Approval-Proposed List for National Register.

Submitted for the record.

III. LEGISLATION

1. S. 2970-2/15/68-Mr. Pearson-90th C

To establish an independent office of Government Procedure to assist the Congress in its oversight of the execution of statutes enacted by the Congress, the evaluation of procedures of executive and independent agencies of the Government, and the adoption of improved means to carry

into effect the policies of the Congress.

EXHIBIT A

The members' opposition to the proposed bill was reported to the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

2. H.R. 15859-3/11/68-Mr.Pepper-90thC

To require that at least 1 per centum of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

EXHIBIT B

The Secretary commented that the Commission had approved a similar bill. The proposed bill would establish an advisory board composed of the Chairman of National Endowment of the Arts, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and seven members appointed by General Services Administration. The board would assist in selecting artists and advise generally on the program for works of art in Federal buildings. He reported that GSA opposed the legislation since it had already established a review board within its own agency.

The members felt that the Directors of the National Gallery of Art and the National Collection of Fine Arts would be more appropriate members than those specified. They favored the purpose of the bill. They thought the one percent should be "over-and-above the budget" for a building and should be used for special landscape features as well as painting and/or sculpture.

The members views were forwarded to the Committee on Public Works.

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

The Secretary presented and reviewed the following projects.

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington, Maryland Avenue between Sixth and Seventh Streets.

A proposal for the development of a triangular site had been selected by the Redevelopment Land Agency from a competition. The members had previously reviewed a brochure describing the plan and had opposed the architectural expression and elevations as indicated therein.

A model presented at the meeting confirmed their action.

Final action was withheld until a conference with RLA officials in the afternoon.

b. Proposed Building Across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks, Southwest. Chloethiel Woodard Smith and Associated Architects.

Mrs. Smith withdrew from the room.

Schematic sketches of three possibilities for an office building were submitted. The structure would span the Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks and provide a combined subway and bus station for the L'Enfant Plaza Area.

The members felt that programs of RLA, GSA, and L'Enfant Plaza officials for this area should be coordinated before any project is considered.

Final action was withheld until a conference with RLA officials and the architect in the afternoon.

c. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building - Proposed Design. Vlastimil Koubek, architect.

Photographs of the L'Enfant Plaza plan developed by I.M. Pei, architect, and drawings indicating changes to his design for the West Building were submitted. The members decided to discuss the changes with the architect in the afternoon. They again stressed the need for a conference of all agencies to review proposed programs and plans for this area before any firm commitments were made on individual projects.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Child Research Center, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design, Johannes and Murray and Associates, architects.

A model, perspective and plans reflected the program requirement for a design of residential character and a site separated from the main research section. The brick building with concrete shingles would be in the southwest corner of the NIH campus.

The members approved the deliberate residential scale and felt that other program requirements had been fairly well met. There were no major objections to the site and design. A meeting with the architect was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to General Services Administration.

EXHIBIT C

b. Howard University Teaching Hospital - Proposed Design by Smith, Hinchman and Grylls, Associates, Inc., architect.

A model, perspectives and plans were submitted for a preliminary

design of the hospital unit adjacent to the medical complex of Howard University and on the site of the old Griffith Stadium. The purpose of the submission was for advice on the massing and general plans -- not on the architectural expression.

The members felt a master plan and aerial photographs were needed before any advice could be given on the overall scheme. A conference with the architect and officials of GSA and Howard University was scheduled for the afternoon.

3. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Capitol East Playground and Natatorium - Revised Design. Delmar and Hilleary, architects.

A model and drawings indicated a simplified plan. The program had been changed to a requirement for one large swimming pool and a small wading pool.

The Secretary mentioned that the officials of the Department were concerned about the heavy appearance of the design. He stated that fear of vandalism prevented an open glass design although the neighborhood was an attractive section in the Capitol East area.

The members decided to discuss the design with the architect during the afternoon session.

4. Department of Interior, National Park Service

Proposed Ellipse Fountains at Constitution Avenue and 16th Street, N.W. Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, San Francisco, architects.

Mr. Bunshaft withdrew from the room.

A model and perspective revealed a circular motif for the area with fountains on square bases framing the entrance to the park from Constitution Avenue and flanking a visual axis between the White House and Jefferson Memorial. Details of the plan will be submitted later.

The members approved the plan. The National Park Service was informed of the Commission's action.

EXHIBIT D

5. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Center Leg of Inner Loop, Design of South Portal and Walls. Wright and Gane, architects.

Drawings indicated that the design repeated the North Portal plan

as the Commission had recommended. The walls would be vertical, granite slabs - plane faced, another recommendation of the members. A typical green highway sign was recessed in a special panel over the tunnel entrance. This position was considered excellent and should be repeated in other portal designs. No further discussion was necessary. A conference with Highway officials was cancelled.

The Department of Highways and Traffic was informed of the Commission's approval.

EXHIBIT E

6. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Guard Houses, Arlington Memorial Cemetery - Proposed Design by Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects.

The Commission had previously recommended a design similar to the White House guardhouse. The model resembled a wooden, octagonal shaped gazebo or garden shelter. The program was for a building which was to be permanent.

Mr. Sasaki stated that the design should be restudied to overcome the temporary and quaint look, at the same time avoiding anything that resembled "telephone booth" design. The design was unanimously disapproved.

The Department of the Army was informed of the Commission's action.

7. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Old Georgetown Act

a. Appendix 2

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2.

EXHIBIT F

b. O.G. 68-170, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W. - Heating and Cooling Plant, Georgetown University - Revised site plan and design. Mariani and Associates, architects.

Controversy over the previously approved site adjacent to the Glover Archbold park area resulted in the selection of an interior site on the campus south of the Observatory and east of the gymnasium. A revised design was submitted.

The Commission approved the new site and recommended that the cornice line be lowered to the cornice height of the adjacent gymnasium. An additional row of trees along the south boundary of the parking lot was also suggested.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses

and Inspections.

c. Rehabilitation of Old Warehouse, 1054-31st St., N.W. (Added)

A group of developers proposed to rehabilitate an old warehouse adjoining the C&O Canal. The Commercial complex would include a new inner block, 90-foot high office building. The Secretary commented that the project was submitted "to get a very preliminary reaction from the Commission on the feasibility" of such a project.

The members confirmed the Board's approval and commended the developers and the architect on their solution.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

EXHIBIT G

Shipstead Luce Act

a. Appendix

There was no objection to recommendations by the staff on the Shipstead-Luce Applications listed on Appendix . EXHIBIT H

b. S.W. Communications Center, South Capitol and E Sts., S.W.
Revised Design by Chatelain, Gauger and Nolan, architects.

The Commission had previously requested that the design be restudied and submitted with an indication of the ultimate size of the structure. Proposing to build a sizable addition to the side and add three stories to the existing limestone building, the architect had developed a simplified geometric statement. The Commission approved the project and requested the entire structure be built at one time. Detailed plans were requested for final review.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

c. American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building -
Revised Design. Mitchell and Giurgola, architects.

A series of sketches indicated a change in the fenestration of the upper floors. The horizontal window bands diminished in width as they extended toward the roof. Other changes were discussed in detail.

The members concluded that the architect should present his design and they should comment on various aspects of the plan. They agreed that the owners should be asked if the design has their approval. No action would be taken until a closed session after the conference scheduled to follow immediately.

V. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

Mr. Mills and Mr. Scheik representing the AIA and Mr. Giurgola, architect, attended the meeting.

After Mr. Giurgola had given a detailed explanation of his design, the Chairman inquired if the Building Committee of the AIA had approved it. Mr. Mills responded that the Committee had not seen this phase. He commented that the Committee had previously met with the architect and had established the plan but time had not permitted a review of the design before this meeting.

(The Chairman left for a White House Conference. Mr. Sasaki presided).

Mr. Bunshaft remarked that the design is a "sculptural approach rather than a "use (offices) approach." He stated that it had "too many motifs."

Commenting on the purpose of the submission, Mr. Mills stated that his Committee did not want approval of the project as a finished design but approval of the general principles of the plan and comments on the development.

The members recommended that concrete should be considered for exterior material and a model presented at the next meeting. The transcripts of the discussion are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT I

Mr. Sasaki later reported to the Chairman that the members had approved "the general site plan, general massing, articulation of the upper level and level below." Review for the Chairman is contained in transcripts submitted as EXHIBIT J.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(The Chairman returned and presided thereafter.)

2. D.C. Government, Redevelopment Land Agency

Messrs. Conny, Miller and Sherman of RLA attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington.

Mr. Conny explained that the competition was held to select a developer for the land and was not an architectural competition. The selection was made on the developer's architectural concept for the land use and not on any architectural scheme or design. The developer would select an architect.

According to Mr. Miller the plan was selected because the low wings related to the higher element and gave a different "spirit" to the space. He felt it was not another "functional-looking" building.

Mr. Sherman reported that the criteria for the competition contained the Urban Renewal Plan requirement - only 30 percent of the land could be developed at 90 feet and no more than 60 percent of the site could be covered. Utility easements and a National Park Service reservation restricting buildings were problems encountered in the site.

The Commission had no objection to the selection of the developer and an architect but could not approve the design nor siting of the proposed building. The RLA officials agreed to restudy the problem.

b. Proposed Building Across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks

Mr. Holmes, architect, attended the meeting. Mrs. Smith withdrew from the room.

The Chairman stated that the Commission recommended a joint meeting of all people involved in projects for this area. Each project must be a part of the total area and cannot be considered individually. Those projects were: this proposal, the submitted L'Enfant Plaza building, the site south and west of the Forrestal Building near the Department of Agriculture Annex and the portal site adjoining the Potomac.

c. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building - Proposed Design

Mr. Koubek, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Koubek explained the variations he had planned to the I.M. Pei scheme for the building. The overhang had been set back and made smaller. The exterior material would be the same color aggregate and finish as the north/south buildings but would be pre-cast rather than poured-in-place.

The members considered the design appropriate to the L'Enfant Plaza plan but felt the end elevations should be restudied to reflect the front and rear elevations.

The Chairman reported that the Commission was recommending a joint meeting of all groups having projects in this area. The landscaping of

the West Building would be considered then.

The Commission approved the design and requested that the end elevations be restudied.

3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Child Research Center, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design.

Interview was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

b. Howard University Teaching Hospital - Proposed Design

Dr. Jason of the University Hospital and Mr. Sheoris, architect, attended the meeting.

In explaining the master plan for the hospital area, Mr. Sheoris stated that it had been adjusted to the Justement Plan for the University. His detailed explanation included future plans for the Hospital Center and its program in relation to the University and to the community.

The Chairman stated the Commission's approval, in general, and commended the University officials on obtaining qualified professional services at the outset of the project.

The Commission's action was reported to General Services Administration.

~~EXHIBIT~~ *

4. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Center Leg of Inner Loop, Design of South Portal and Walls

Interview was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

5. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Capitol East Playground and Natatorium - Revised Design

Mr. Purcell of the Department and Mr. Hilleary, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Hilleary defended his design and also his previously submitted plan. Mr. Purcell defended the design in relation to the "using agency", the Recreation Department.

The members felt the design was not acceptable. They offered several suggestions to simplify the plan and recommended that it be restudied.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds.

EXHIBIT L

6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Southwest Communications Center - Revised Design

Interview was considered unnecessary and cancelled.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Charles H. Atherton". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "C" and "A".

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2970

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 15, 1968

Mr. PEARSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SCOTT) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Government Operations

A BILL

To establish an independent Office of Government Procedure to assist the Congress in its oversight of the execution of statutes enacted by the Congress, the evaluation of procedures of executive and independent agencies of the Government, and the adoption of improved means to carry into effect the policies of the Congress.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act may be cited as the "Office of Government
4 Procedure Act of 1968".

5 **DECLARATION OF POLICY**

- 6 SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the full and proper
7 exercise of its legislative authority and responsibility con-

1 ferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States makes
2 necessary the establishment of an Office of Government Pro-
3 cedure independent of the executive branch of Government
4 to aid the Congress in exercising oversight with respect to the
5 compliance with policies embodied in legislation enacted by
6 the Congress by executive and independent agencies charged
7 with the administration thereof, and to provide means
8 whereby the Congress can determine the extent to which the
9 policy objectives of such legislation are achieved through the
10 execution and administration thereof.

11 OFFICE ESTABLISHED

12 SEC. 3. (a) To assist the Congress in the discharge of its
13 constitutional responsibility to make all laws, and for the
14 purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of
15 this Act, there is hereby established the Office of Govern-
16 ment Procedure (referred to hereinafter as the "Office").

17 (b) The Office shall be headed by a Director appointed
18 by the President by and with the advice and consent of the
19 Senate for a term of fifteen years.

20 (c) The Director may be removed by joint resolution
21 of both Houses of Congress upon prior notice and stated
22 cause and after hearing before a joint committee of the
23 Congress established for that purpose and by no other means.

24 (d) The Director shall receive compensation at the rate

1 prescribed by law for the compensation of the Comptroller
2 General of the United States.

3 STAFF OF THE OFFICE

4 SEC. 4. (a) The Director shall have power to appoint
5 and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems
6 advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United
7 States Code, governing appointments in the competitive
8 service, or the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III
9 of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and Gen-
10 eral Schedule of pay rates.

11 (b) The Office may procure temporary and intermittent
12 services of experts and consultants pursuant to section 3109
13 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$100
14 per diem for individuals.

15 DUTIES OF THE OFFICE

16 SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the function of the Office to—

17 (1) conduct studies to determine whether the ad-
18 ministrative procedures of the executive and independent
19 agencies of the Government are in all respects in compli-
20 ance with the letter and intent of the laws passed by
21 Congress;

22 (2) conduct studies of specific fields of administra-
23 tive law, and otherwise assist the Congress to conduct
24 such studies, in order to effect more adequate and clear

1 statutory standards of delegation of policymaking dis-
2 cretion to such agencies;

3 (3) report periodically to the Congress incidents
4 of noncompliance by executive and independent agencies
5 with laws governing administrative procedures;

6 (4) audit the substance and procedures of admin-
7 istrative action of such agencies to ascertain the extent
8 to which agency policies are not published as rules as
9 required by law;

10 (5) investigate and advise the Congress as to the
11 extent to which the policies of the Congress could be
12 more effectively carried out if the responsible agencies
13 which exercise adjudicative powers were to formulate,
14 publish for public information, and comply with state-
15 ments of principles to govern the interpretation of pro-
16 visions of law administered by them;

17 (6) in its discretion to investigate and evaluate
18 complaints made concerning administrative procedures
19 of such agencies;

20 (7) to gather and transmit to Congress the informa-
21 tion necessary to effectively evaluate program perform-
22 ance by executive and independent agencies of the
23 Government, and to ascertain whether legislative pro-
24 grams are achieving the policy objectives anticipated
25 by the Congress; and

1 (8) submit recommendations, from time to time,
2 directly to the Congress for additional legislation which
3 the Office deems necessary or desirable to further the
4 purposes of this Act.

5 POWERS OF THE OFFICE

6 SEC. 6. (a) (1) Under such regulations as the Direc-
7 tor shall prescribe, the Director, or any employee of the
8 Office duly designated by the Director, may conduct such
9 hearings as may be required for the performance of the
10 duties of the Office, administer oaths for the purpose of
11 taking evidence in any such hearing, and issue subpoenas
12 to compel witnesses to appear and testify and to compel the
13 production of relevant documentary evidence in any such
14 hearing. Such subpoenas shall bear the signature of the Direc-
15 tor, and may be served by any person designated by the
16 Director for that purpose.

17 (2) The provisions of section 1821 of title 28, United
18 States Code, shall apply to witnesses summoned to appear
19 at any such hearing. The per diem and mileage allowances
20 of witnesses so summoned under authority conferred by this
21 section shall be paid from funds appropriated to the Office.

22 (3) Any person who willfully neglects or refuses to
23 appear, or refuses to qualify as a witness or to testify, or
24 to produce any evidence in obedience to any subpoena duly

1 issued under authority of this section shall be fined not
2 more than \$500, or imprisoned for not more than six
3 months, or both. Upon the certification by the Director of
4 the facts concerning any such willful disobedience by any
5 person to the United States Attorney for any judicial dis-
6 trict in which such person resides or is found, such attorney
7 shall proceed by information for the prosecution of such
8 person for such offense.

9 (b) The Director is authorized to enter into contracts
10 or other agreements with Federal agencies, private firms,
11 institutions, and individuals for the conduct of such research
12 or surveys as may be required in the performance of the
13 duties of the Office.

14 (c) The Director is authorized to secure directly from
15 any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commis-
16 sion, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality
17 of the United States Government, information, suggestions,
18 estimates, and statistics required for the discharge of the
19 duties of the Office under this Act. Subject to the require-
20 ments of national security, each such department, bureau,
21 agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment,
22 or instrumentality, is authorized and directed to furnish such
23 information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to
24 the Office upon written request made by the Director.

APPROPRIATIONS

1
2 SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
3 to the Office such sums as may be required to carry out the
4 provisions of this Act.

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 15859

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 11, 1968

MR. PEPPER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To require that at least 1 per centum of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this
4 Act (1) to encourage the development of a strong and vital
5 American art through maximum use of American artists
6 in the decoration and beautification of Federal buildings;
7 (2) to promote the progress of the useful arts; (3) to
8 secure suitable art of the best quality for the decoration
9 and beautification of buildings of the Federal Government
10 in this country and in foreign countries; (4) to carry out

I

EXHIBIT B

1 this work in such a way as will best assist in stimulating
2 the developuent of American art and rewarding the out-
3 standing talent which develops; and (5) to encourage and
4 secure local participation and autonomy to the greatest extent
5 compatible with the quality of the programs authorized by
6 this Act.

7 (b) As used in this Act—

8 (1) the term “decoration and beautification” in-
9 cludes murals, mosaics, paintings, sculpture (including
10 architectural and monumental sculpture), ironwork,
11 pottery, weaving, woodcarving, stonework, and artistic
12 work in other media.

13 (2) the term “Administrator” means the Adminis-
14 trator of General Services.

15 (3) the term “Federal agency” means any depart-
16 ment, agency, or establishment of the Federal Govern-
17 ment.

18 (c) Whenever a nonmilitary public building is to be
19 constructed by or under contract to a Federal agency, the
20 Administrator, the head of the Federal agency performing
21 the construction, and the head of the Federal agency which
22 will have custody and control over such building upon its
23 completion shall jointly determine what percentage of the
24 total amonnt of money available for the construction of such
25 building should be used to provide decoration and beautifi-

1 cation work for such building, except that such percentage
2 shall not be less than 1 per centum of such amount. Such
3 determination shall, whenever practicable, be made in ad-
4 vance of the availability of the funds for such construction,
5 and shall be based upon a consideration of the purposes for
6 which the building is to be used, the types of decoration and
7 beautification work which would be most fitting and appro-
8 priate in the light of such purposes, and any other factors
9 deemed relevant by the Administrator and such agency
10 heads. Within the limits of the percentage determined un-
11 der the first sentence of this subsection, the Administrator
12 and such agency heads shall jointly prescribe the type and
13 extent of the decoration and beautification work, if any, to
14 be provided for such building, and shall select the artists,
15 sculptors, or other persons to execute such work.

16 (d) There is hereby established an Advisory Board
17 (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"),
18 which shall advise and consult with the Administrator in
19 the performance of his duties under this Act. The Board
20 shall consist of the Chairman of the National Endowment
21 for the Arts established by the National Foundation on the
22 Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, the Secretary of the
23 Smithsonian Institution, and seven other members appointed
24 by the Administrator from among private citizens of the

1 United States who are widely recognized for their knowl-
2 edge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, the
3 fields of decoration and beautification work and architecture,
4 and whose knowledge and experience in such fields will
5 enable them to assist the Administrator in the performance
6 of his duties under this Act. In making such appointments
7 the Administrator shall give due consideration to the recom-
8 mendations for nomination submitted by leading national
9 organizations in the fields of decoration and beautification
10 work and architecture. The term of office of each member
11 of the Board appointed by the Administrator shall be two
12 years: except that, of the members first appointed, four shall
13 be appointed for terms of one year. No member of the
14 Board appointed by the Administrator shall be eligible for
15 reappointment during the one-year period following the
16 expiration of his term. The Board shall meet at the call
17 of the Administrator, but not less often than twice each year.
18 The Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts shall
19 be Chairman of the Board.

20 (e) In order to secure the participation of the best
21 possible talent under this Act, there shall be established such
22 procedures as may be deemed appropriate by the Admin-
23 istrator to provide for the award of commissions without
24 competition, as well as for the award of commissions through

1 competitions in which artists are invited to compete and are
2 paid for designs submitted.

3 SEC. 2. This Act shall not be deemed to invalidate any
4 provision in any Act of Congress or Executive order vesting
5 authority in the Commission of Fine Arts.

H. R. 15859

A BILL

To require that at least 1 per centum of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

By Mr. Pepper

MARCH 11, 1968

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

NOTED
MAR 21 1968
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
RECEIVED

3 May 1968

Dear Mr. Knott:

This is to confirm Commission of Fine Arts approval of preliminary designs for the National Institutes of Health Child Research Center at its April 17th meeting. The design was prepared by Johannes and Murray Assoc. of Silver Spring, Md.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Honorable Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT C

3 May 1968

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

At its April 17th meeting the Commission of Fine Arts approved the designs for a pair of fountains at 16th and Constitution, N.W. as submitted by the National Park Service.

The Commission would like to see further details and materials as they are developed. In particular the height and volume of the water jets will have to be carefully studied in relation to the base of the fountain.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Honorable George B. Hartzog
Director
National Park Service
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D

3 May 1968

Dear Mr. Airis:

This is to confirm the April 17th, 1968 Commission of Fine Arts approval of the wall designs for the South Portal of the Center Leg of the Inner Loop. The Commission feels that the system has been greatly improved by coordinating both north and south portal designs and by recessing the large overhead signs in the portal entrances.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director
D.C. Department of Highways
and Traffic
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT E

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

4/17/68

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
OG 68-

185 3144 M St., NW
Georgetown Sales
ACTION: Not recommended. Proposed character unsuitable. Suggest using letters to match exist., 4/17/68.

187 3601 M St., NW
Mobile Oil Corp.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of sign, lettering, type of illumination unsuitable in the OG area. Recom. opaque-faced back-lighted ltrs. of an appropriate character, 4/17/68.

188 3243 P St., NW
African High Life
ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of sign & lettering unsuitable in the OG area. Recom. opaque-faced back-lighted ltrs. of an appropriate character, 4/17/68.

194 3000 M St., NW
Sinclair Refining Co.
ACTION: Recom'd., 4/15/68.

198 1332-29th St., NW
Mrs. de Montaudouin
ACTION: Prel. drawings recom'd. Request subm. of details as they are developed, particularly of front doorway & window heads. New brick is to match exist. as closely as possible in size, texture & color. Erect sample of brick & mortar on site for app'l. New roof to match old in material & color, 4/10/68.

EXHIBIT

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

4/17/68

ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

NO
OG 68-

Inf.

170 3800 Reser. Rd., NW
Georgetown University

Heating & Cooling Plant for campus. Also samples of concrete,
alum. & glass. Brick Sanford #141-F W/C.

ACTION: No obj. to mass & siting of bldg., but recom. that cornice line of heating & cooling plant be
lowered, if possible, to cornice height of adjacent gymnasium. Recom. screen planting as shown on drawings.
Also request erection of sample brick & mortar panel on site before final material approval, 4/17/68.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

MAR 29 1968

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
OG 68-

158 1576 Wisc. Ave., NW
Texaco, Inc.

1 d-f, 24 sq-ft, illuminated sign to replace exist. sign on pole.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of sign, lettering, type of illumination unsuitable in the OG area. Recom. opaque-faced back-lighted ltrs. of an appropriate character, 3/21/68.

Inf.

169 1054-31st St., NW
Bok Constr. Co.

Remodel exist. warehouse, remove storage sheds, & constr. new bldg. containing offices & shops.
ACTION: Recom'd. Request definitive review of further details as they are developed, 3/21/68.

171

1072 Thos. Jeff. St., NW
Margaret Ochs

Repair exist. frame bldg. tin roof using like material. Add 2 brick steps & small iron handrail for each exist. front doorway. Remove iron entr. to cellar.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided work proceeds only as a restoration of orig. elements. Recom. that antique photos be located if possible. This off. has available some historical inf. on the house. An on-the-site app'l. of the proposed siding is requested. Exterior lantern not recom'd. Suggest use of 6-panel doors rather than 4-panel, 4-light doors proposed, 3/21/68.

172

1074 Thos. Jeff. St., NW
Mrs. Margaret Ochs

Replace loose stucco on alley side of house. Repair & paint 2 coats. Replace old door to its orig. stone top as shown in print. Replace 2 stone window sills. Repair brick at side of doorway. Remove coal hole in sidewalk.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided work proceeds only as a restoration of orig. elements, plus indicated doorway features, 3/21/68.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

MAR 29 1968

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
OG 68-

New slate roof over entr.

173 1421-34th St., NW
Mrs. Jean Hill

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. - incl. photos of exist. conditions, 3/19/68.

174 3252-3254 N St., NW
Leo M. Bernstein

Lower grade in front to sidewalk level, remove steps, replace front door with window at 3254. Entr. walk to 3252 & 3254 from public sidewalk to be of brick.

ACTION: No obj., 3/21/68.

175 1063 Wisc. Ave., NW
Home & Garden Shop

Install 2 bracket lights on front of bldg.

ACTION: No obj., 3/21/68.

176 2913 M St., NW

A. L. Wheeler (Restaurant)

1 brownish red canvas awning over 1st fl. windows & door. No fixed iron frames or posts.

ACTION: No obj. to awning proposed over front 3 windows & door only, but would strongly urge an alternate means of sun control. The proposed awning would obscure a great deal of arch'l. detail, 3/21/68.

Inf.
177

3112-14-16 "O" St., NW
Christ Episcopal Church

Addn. of Chapel bldg. to Church & alterations to Rectory.

ACTION: No obj. to concept. Stoop & stair design is not recom'd. Suggest detailing, iron for example, that is more appropriate to the house, 3/21/68.

178 1332-29th St., NW

Mrs. M. Montaudouin

Constr. brick addn. to side & rear of exist. 2-story dwelling.

ACTION: No obj. to concept, but relationship of kitchen wing is still unresolved. General plan proportion & fenestration of kitchen are not compatible to other proposals. Recom. consideration of attached sketch or conference with the arch. Exposed concrete block walls are not recom'd. in Georgetown. Suggest that all d-h sash have same proportions for added harmony, 3/21/68.

MAR 29 1968

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER
179 3108 "O" St., NW
Christ Church, Georgetown

PROJECT

Garden-Courtyard to newly altered Chapel of St. Jude, being brick-faced ret. wall & paving leading to Keith Hall & the Chapel from only access to latter - "O" St.

ACTION: No obj., 3/21/68.

180 3146 Dumbarton St., NW
S. Levy & J. Snyder, Jr.
ACTION: Recom. restudy of facade eliminating slate roof, substituting flat roof instead. Do not use oversized brick, 3/21/68.

2-story brick retail store. Brick sample: "L. C. Smith, Inc."

181 1644-31st St., NW
Armistead Peter
ACTION: No obj., provided proposed fence follows line of service drive rather than an independent course up south lawn. Request revised layout, 3/21/68.

6' chain-link fence to run directly no. from exist. 6' chain-link (along Q St.) at a point approx. 100' east of 32nd St.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

APR 12 1968

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
OG 68-

182 1321-31st St., NW
Mrs W. Moorehead
ACTION: Recom'd., 3/26/68.

Install one #6108 - B sturdy fixture on brick pier at front steps.

183 3211 R St., NW
J. V. Mladek

ACTION: Recom'd. Brick on new wing to match exist. house, 3/26/68.
Resubmittal of entr. (on side of house) which was disap'd.

184 2619 P St., NW
Robert Enzell
ACTION: No obj., 4/3/68.

Convert retail store space on 1st fl. into 2 apt. units.

186 2610 P St., NW
Jerusalem Baptist Church
ACTION: Recom'd., provided door painted black, 3/26/68.

Alterations.

190 1655 Wisc. Ave., NW
Winston H. Wrenn
ACTION: Recom'd. as revised, 4/3/68.

Alter interior spaces--redesign 1st fl. st. windows & entr.

191 1072 Thos. Jeff. St., NW
Mrs. Margaret Ochs

Repairs & renovations.

ACTION: No obj. to replacing door with window. Suggest use of 6-panel front door. Siding sample app'd. as requested in OG 68-171. No obj. to front planting, 4/3/68.

192 1074 Thos. Jeff. St., NW
Mrs. Margaret Ochs
ACTION: No obj. to either 6 or 8-panel door. No obj. to front planting, 4/3/68.

Repairs & renovations.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

APR 1 2 1968

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
OG 68-

New slate roof over entr.

195 1421-34th St., NW
Mrs. Jean Hill

ACTION: Recom'd. for drawings submitted under OG 68-173, provided gutter does not protrude beyond front face of bldg., 4/4/68.

3 May 1968

O.G. 68-169 (Inj-)

Dear Mr. Green:

At its April 17th, 1968 meeting, the Commission of Fine Arts considered designs of a proposed commercial complex at 31st Street and the C & O Canal in Georgetown. The proposal to keep the historic perimeter structures and confine new high construction to the complex center is excellent. The Commission wishes to confirm the favorable reaction of the Old Georgetown Advisory Board and commend the developers on their approach to the project.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Julian P. Green
Asst. Superintendent of
Licenses and Inspections
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

EXHIBIT G

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

4/17/68

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
SL 68-

Building addn.

43 30 E St., SW
C & P Telephone Co.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Request consideration of this project at our meeting on 4/17/68, 4/10/68.

Hqtrs. Bldg. for AIA.

49 1735 New York Ave., NW
American Inst. of Architects.

ACTION: No obj. to mass & siting of structure. Request further details of facade, materials, etc., as they are developed. Care should be given to resolution of motifs of "office" & "special use" flrs., particularly at intersection of 2 wings, 4/17/68.

Telephone Center.

50 30 E St., SW
C & P Telephone Co.

ACTION: The Commission approves the prel. scheme with the addn. to the west, & a uniform height of 90' for the entire bldg., as shown on drawings, with the condition that the projecting fin on the south elevation be eliminated, 4/17/68.

EXHIBIT I

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONSPROJECTADDRESS AND OWNERNO
SL 68-

Change front & rear of store.

39 627 Penna. Ave., NW

Mark Weiss Camera Center

ACTION: App'd., provided bottom moulding on stucco panel lines up with the same elements on the adjacent bld to the right, 2/20/68.

40 8500 East Beach Dr., NW 2-story dwelling.

Andrew D. Bryant

ACTION: Ret'd. for sections thru 2nd fl. windows, showing relation to roof structure. Also restudy baluster design on 2nd fl. balcony, substituting simplified design more to the exterior, 4/3/68.

41 2501 Linnean Ave., NW Topo. - material.

Samuel E. Eastman

ACTION: App'd. Also, design subm'd. under SL 68-38, app'd., 3/19/68.

42 7115-16th St., NW

Prudential Development

1-story brick & cinder-block frame dwell.

ACTION: Disap'd. Design unacceptable because of poor relation of elements & confusion in use of materials, lack of unity in openings & other details. Request restudy, 4/4/68.

44 600 New Hampshire Ave., NW

Watergate Improvements

Stage IV, Bldg. 1. 14-story reinforced concrete apt. bldg.
All materials & textures to match Stages I, II, & III.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Request subm. of model showing relationship of this stage of design to adjoining bldgs. of project. Also request inf. & any new studies regarding the Commission's memo. of 12/12/67 (which accompanied SL 68-22, & questioned the acceptability of balustrades & separating panels on the balconies.), 3/21/68.

45 490 C St., SW

Harry's Service Center

Install nitrogen storage tank. On orders of Fire Marshall, a fence will be erected around the unit.

ACTION: Cyclone fence not recom'd. Suggest a fence that will screen the storage tank, 4/3/68.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

APR 12 1968

PROJECT

ADDRESS AND OWNER

NO
SL 68-

46 801-03 Market St., NW
Monument Parking Co.

1 d-f pole sign, 25 sq-ft, white bckgd. white neon tubing,
behind metal cut-out ltrs. (concealed).

ACTION: App'd., 4/4/68.

47 627 Penna. Ave., NW
Mark Weiss Camera Center

Choice #1: Install 1 s-f cut-out metal ltr. sign with neon
tubing concealed behind ltr., sign box painted white, ltrs.
painted. Choice #2: If present copy not app'd.--plain block
ltrs. will be acceptable.

ACTION: Disap'd. Use vertical upper-case ltrs. only, omitting internal lighting. Relate sign to face of
bldg. as is done next door, 4/4/68.

48 900 Maine Ave., SW
The Gangplank Restaurant

1 d-f sign. 3/4" plywood painted white both sides - sign navy
blue - both sides.

ACTION: App'd., 3/27/68.

think that they will miss this little thing here (indicating on drawing).

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's some loading dock.

MR. ATHERTON: No, really it's the architect's attempt to make two elevations that would, you know, have some sort of proportion, and so on.

MR. BUNSHAFT: He might be right.

MR. ATHERTON: We will at least ask them to explore this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This would make it so it wouldn't count.

MR. ATHERTON: They are going along here at high speed, in any event, and perhaps the less that draws your attention to it, the better it is.

MR. SASAKI: Bill asked me to chair while he was gone, so why don't we just approve that and move to the next item, the AIA Building?

(Mr. Walton withdrew from the conference room, and Mr. Sasaki assumed the chair.)

MR. ATHERTON: I think the chief difference is in the floor plans on the first and ground floor; the rest is very much the same. Primarily of course the differences are in the expression. Do you want to go through these individually?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Put up that plan and let's just look at it.

MR. ATHERTON: This is the ground floor, these are other floors (indicating on plan). They still have a projecting exterior stairway, where you can go directly from the outside up to the mezzanine.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is that the corner where the two buildings meet?

MR. ATHERTON: Yes, this is now this large open space.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Up above it is just a razor line. That corridor is just a little hole.

MR. ATHERTON: That's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What level is that, on that plan on the top sheet?

MR. ATHERTON: A typical office floor.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They seem to have three different widths of slots according to the elevation you're holding. It gets bigger as it goes up.

MR. ATHERTON: Here's the mezzanine level.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Will you show me on that elevation where the mezzanine level is?

MR. ATHERTON: This is the mezzanine level here, as I understand the plan (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: The big opening you see on the first

plan is wide open, then the second, the mezzanine, and then it starts to close.

MR. ATHERTON: That's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Then a couple of floors up closes some more.

MR. ATHERTON: Elevation 80, so this would be a higher floor.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's the top floor.

MR. ATHERTON: That's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And those are slots stepping down here.

MR. ATHERTON: Exactly.

You notice the section here, too, how that is changing, this being the ground floor, this being the mezzanine level here, (indicating) and that is where it narrows there; that floor starts from there up.

MRS. SMITH: What is that line, this level here? AIA isn't on the top.

MR. ATHERTON: I misread the plans. The elevation here is 80, office floors are 91, 102 and 113, so these are office floors here (indicating on sketch).

MR. BUNSHAFT: Do you have an elevation from the street of this project here?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They changed that corner a bit.

MRS. SMITH: Is that triangle still there?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The outside line still goes all the way up, yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What are the two plans on the left -- floor plans?

MR. ATHERTON: Basement plans. One is parking, the other is presumably sewage and so forth, storage, data processing, maintenance, supplies.

I think the parking comes off New York Avenue. There is a slot there in back of this alley. It enters on the east side. It is back here (indicating on sketch). The entrance to parking is provided there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: There seem to be two stairs on this drawing here.

MR. ATHERTON: Yes, this apparently is behind glass. I think that stairway there is an exterior stairway at that location. Here's the one that shows here (indicating). That's the one that comes outside. It shows best here in this plan.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What do we think, team?

MRS. SMITH: That triangle still worries me.

MR. ROSZAK: This opening here, this whole business here I think is extremely poor.

I think there's a kind of factor that creeps a

MRS. SMITH: It was very nice, very nice.

CHATHAM: Yes, it was very nice, very nice.

and we are, yes.

MRS. SMITH: And we are, yes, we are.

Thank you.

MRS. SMITH: Thank you, yes, yes.

and we are, yes, we are, yes, we are.

Thank you, yes, yes.

I think the picture is very nice.

There is a lot of things in the picture.

on the wall, yes, it is very nice.

The picture is very nice.

MRS. SMITH: There is a lot of things in the picture.

Thank you.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, it is very nice.

I think the picture is very nice.

There is a lot of things in the picture.

on the wall, yes, it is very nice.

Thank you.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, it is very nice.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, it is very nice.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, it is very nice.

business, yes, it is very nice.

I think the picture is very nice.

little bit into our thinking, our feeling about this; that is, we're looking at this out of sympathy or objectively as a design. I think this is a very critical point. If it's lousy, I think we ought to turn it down.

MRS. SMITH: I agree with you.

MR. ROSZAK: It is an important building and certainly is undistinguished at this stage, don't you think so?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't know yet, I really don't, what I think.

MR. ATHERTON: Exterior material would be granite. They don't say what color but say it will be a compatible color.

MRS. SMITH: It all seems so unnecessarily complex.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What are these dots?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Trees.

Sort of strips of pavement.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's all pavement.

MR. ATHERTON: You mention complexity, but I think this is uppermost in the minds of these architects. They would say it's ordered complexity in planning a building.

MR. SASAKI: My feeling is that if each of us designed a building, we would design it a little bit differently in the same way as we speak differently and dress

little bit more out of the way, and I think that's

just as we're looking at this one, it's coming in from the

as a design. I think this is a very good one.

It is a lovely, I think we ought to have it.

MRS. SMITH: I agree with you.

MR. ROSS: It is an interesting building and

certainly is distinguished at this point, don't you

think?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't know. I really don't

what I think.

MR. ATHERTON: (Enter Mr. Attherton) I think

they don't say what color but say it will be a

color.

MRS. SMITH: It will mean an unnecessary

MR. BUNNELL: What are you going to

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

Not of this of course.

MR. BUNNELL: It's all over.

MR. ATHERTON: You mention something, don't you?

This is important in the minds of these architects.

Would say it's ordered completely in planning.

MR. BUNNELL: The feeling is that it's

designs a building, we would design in a little

different in the same way as we have different

differently, and I think that is all right. If it is fashionable to have a triangle thing, you have to accept this is the fashion today. The thing here seems to me, just looking at this, this is the first time I have seen it, they are conscientiously trying to meet the objections we had to the first building, which was the undifferentiated height of the glass up to here (indicating). As I said before, I didn't object so much to that as everything coming in this way, because it reminded me a little bit of the Ford Foundation building with the heavy cap and the glass here.

Now they are trying to keep this mass down to this level (indicating). These stairways and so forth, I wouldn't worry too much, because as Mr. Atherton said, it is to give some sort of interplay from the outside in. I don't object to that. This is a very bad perspective drawing showing that, because it looks sort of arbitrarily tacked on, but it isn't, really.

Again, in appraising it, it seems to me there is a consistency in the building. Before there was some ambivalence on what kind of material to use, whether concrete or brick, but so far this looks like a granite-faced building.

MR. ROSZAK: But also it looks like a garage.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I wonder if I might ask a question.

Could the Fine Arts approve this on the basis it met the requirements of mass and color and the scale of the thing does not offend the surrounding buildings, but does not enter into any comments concerning the character of the architecture, which they are leaving to the owner to accept? Now I ask that question, whether, in other words, the Fine Arts can approve it for mass and does not necessarily approve it for architecture, so I think the A.I.A. deserves this. I think this is a goulash, I think it is not architecture at all; and it will be a freak of 1967, but if you hire Giurgola, this is what you are going to get, but that doesn't mean the Fine Arts has to agree it is a fine building. That's the point I raise, and I also don't think you can make Giurgola do a building that maybe the Fine Arts Commission would agree is a fine building. I think it's a tour de force of a goulash of all kinds of things.

I don't personally want to be a party to approving this as a total design. I would be a party in approving it as to mass and color, but specifically say that the character of the architecture which does not offend the neighborhood, which is our problem, and that the internal design which is really the major design of the court, facing the court, is one we leave to A.I.A. to decide.

Well, they've accepted it. I just raise that point, because if we are going to -- which we've never done--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Charlie, how does that affect you?

MR. ATHERTON: The reason it's brought here is that Shipstead along that line says the Commission is to exercise reasonable control in order to preserve order, and I think the word "taste" is in the law, too -- good taste and order bordering the Federal domain, so I think you could very well have limited approval and make a very strong condition that you accept certain areas of the design. I think that is possible.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we can be positive in saying we approve the mass, approve the materials, sense of order, facade facing the street; but I would put it we are not participating in approval of the external facade of the court, which is part of the owner's decision -- some way of doing that.

MR. ATHERTON: This is not really the Commission's consideration. It's how it affects the Federal domain.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The neighborhood.

MR. ATHERTON: That's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The only thing is I don't think we ought to be vague. I really don't think the Commission

ought to be a full part and party of this as a total building. I don't want to be, but I don't see any way of changing Giurgola, whose road to success is to make sculpture of the first three floors.

I do think we could give a commitment to mass. This is really a small building. Mass and color.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, I know we have entered lots of controversy over buildings before, so I don't mean to evade controversy, but I just wonder, in expressing our view to this group, this afternoon, when they come in, I think they ought to make a presentation. We could have, it seems to me, a very frank discussion. But then it seems to me at the time of approval or disapproval, why don't we just simply give an approval and not --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I personally will not be a party to that. I'm voting against it is all.

MR. SASAKI: This would be all right. I think you can register a vote.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We're talking about giving total approval or total disapproval.

MR. SASAKI: That's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Let's have a dry run before they come here. They're pretty confused, you know; we gave them mass approval at the last meeting.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We also have a technique we have

done before, of no objections.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I have objection to approving the whole thing. I have listed the way I approve it.

MR. SASAKI: We need not state our decision this afternoon.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In the end it comes out the Fine Arts either did or did not approve this job.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In their presence we don't have to give your ruling. We can work out the wording of it in private session, but we let them make a presentation and ask questions, and then thank them. Then this afternoon we'll work out exactly --

MR. SASAKI: It is closed, so we can have a free conversation.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We don't have to do anything until you come back, Bill. We can listen to them and say nothing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it is agreed, then, that is our course for the next hour.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We'll not say anything to encourage or discourage them. They should not get the feeling we are approving or disapproving.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Then we will carefully work out our decisions this afternoon.

MR. SASAKI Why don't you introduce it and then leave?

MR. BUNSHAFT: What are they going to talk about? They know we can read plans. I know we have to be courteous.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They must have their full time, and I hope a few questions will be asked so they don't think we are cold.

Charlie, our afternoon isn't heavy?

MR. ATHERTON: It's abbreviated.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's fine. We've told two or three not to come in.

MR. ATHERTON: We moved up the swimming pool, so you should be out of here by 3:30 or a quarter of four.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I find it less offensive than earlier designs; it may be worse architecture, but it is less offensive and phased into the setting more, and in this sense I like it better.

MRS. SMITH But to represent American architects, architecture done by architects, approved by the Fine Arts Commission, it makes a curious package.

MR. ROSZAK: It sure does.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In fact, the more I think about it, you can't give a qualified approval. I think what I suggested, the Fine Arts Commission would be renegging on its job where

you approve just mass, color, and how it looks along the street.

MRS. SMITH: Then other people would expect you to do the same.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Also it's sort of chicken, so what you get down to is either approving or disapproving.

MR. ATHERTON: Giurgola is here but not the others.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm afraid we better wait on this ticklish thing until the whole group is here, or they won't think they have had their hearing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Does the owner approve this total design? They may be trying it out on us, to see -- I think it would be interesting to know if the owner presenting this, if this is what he approves.

MRS. SMITH: Is there no model of this now?

CHAIRMAN WALTON No.

MRS. SMITH: I think it's terribly difficult to see without a model. I don't understand that glass, the A.I.A. floor.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That corner is really a beaut!

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's mad.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In this sketch these look like big piers. If you go around the corner, it's not piers, it's a huge wall.

Well, in this kind of architecture you have to be ugly, it's sort of art-proof, but I think this is uglier, sort of amateurish. This hole would be unbelievable. The idea of the hole would be nice for a gun well. This is an L-shaped piece of stone, whatever you call that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I know what he means.

MRS. SMITH: Well, it has such a split personality. It's top three floors are a building building.

MR. ROSZAK: This is probably the way he's been affected by our wishes.

MR. SASAKI: Yes, he is trying to interpret our wishes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, I don't think so.

MR. ROSZAK: It reflects a state of mind, and he is going in three different directions. It is not even schizoid.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, we're in a very tough position here. If we approve it -- I don't see how we can. If we disapprove it, he is getting nowhere but we turned down a couple more important things than this, which just stopped dead.

MR. SASAKI: Have an open conversation, ask them if they like the building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Oh, well, they'll say they do, I'm sure.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think what we ask them is, does it have their approval.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Of the ownership. Whoever the owners are.

MRS. SMITH: I only know individuals, you know. I don't know what committee set up there is.

MR. SASAKI: I should think it's like any corporation, any corporate client who can't get unanimous approval.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In a corporate membership, it would be less and less approval, rather than more and more with each succeeding scheme, I think, until you get down to really a rump.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good morning, Mr. Giurgola.

MR. MILLS: I don't think there's anything I have to say as the Committee Chairman, but Mr. Giurgola, the designer, is here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Fine. Thank you.

Mr. Giurgola.

MR. GIURGOLA: Since we left last time, we worked in two directions to revise the elevation of the interior garden. Basically the plan remains with the same intent of entering from New York Avenue to an archway into the building, covered by part of the building into a

court here, which will be glazed on all sides, and on top, too; and it enlarges this place over here (indicating on sketch), which is higher than the level of the garden.

It is more obvious in this elevation, a section where the level of this sort of paved area is above the garden itself. Trees really make a belt around this open park area here, so that a great deal of the building in the elevation is taken by these trees, which rise up to the level of the second and third floors.

We did most of the study on this elevation here (indicating sketch) and we resolved that. As you remember, we had the building faced with stone work, granite, and we had this very long band of windows. Now we came to a sort of unit window which is composed of two vertical elements and a sort of ceiling which is sloping over here, so that the whole element of the window will probably be a bronze color, aluminum, dark, with a rather dark granite here, in keeping with the color of the Octagon.

We like to feel the sense of a sort of shield that these two facades are, because they really contain only equipment for air induction elements over here under this hood sort of, so these two shields come to this gap and these slowly open up -- and reveal the light, also, of the large court inside.

We tend to have this as a firewall all the way around. There's some problem here about the exit. We intend

to keep this entrance for A.I.A., but there is also a chance for the rental office on top to go out to this balcony over here.

Basically we have the same plan as before. On the right side, on the ground floor, the exhibition area; an auditorium with some services, and in the upper part a balcony which serves as the conference room and meeting room, and then on this end the Board Room which faces on New York Avenue, and under this is exhibit space so there is still the intent of carving into the building in the lower floor, and these two elevations show the side of the auditorium and the Board Room, where the stair goes up from this vestibule and the side of the exhibition hall, this balcony running through.

We maintain this kind of definition of this very straight elevation down. I think this is more a presentation of an intent, really. We have this configuration here out -- there is a difference of level of about one floor from here to down here, so this is for us a container, rather letting this elevation slip out and having a sort of balcony here. We like to produce the same sort of tension that exists now in entering into something and from the top here, although this top would be enclosed by a wall, yet we like to terminate this thing into something so that resulted in a large front here, which however we tried

to keep this apartment for a few days, and then to go
for the rental office on the 15th of this month.
Very truly,
Yours,

Enclosed you have the same, and also
on the right side, on the right side, the building
first, an apartment with some furniture, and in the
left a balcony - after which is the apartment with
kitchen room, and then on this side the second one, which
on the left, kitchen, and what else is still there is
there is still the kitchen to the left, and building is
first floor, and there are apartments on the side of the
building and the main room, where the first one is
from the vestibule and the side of the building (left)
this apartment is very large.

The apartment is a kind of building of this
very apartment is very large, it is a kind of a house
kind of an income (left). The first apartment is
very large - it is a kind of a house of 1000
and first floor has been built for 1000
commercial, other things are also built for 1000
having a sort of balcony room, on the side of the
sort of balcony that is built for 1000 and 1000
and from the top floor, although it is not built for 1000
by a wall, but we like to rent it for 1000 and 1000
so this building is a large room, and it is very large.

to reduce the impact by setting back the side over here.

It probably shows a little better in this sketch -- to get an entrance adequate to the kind of space inside which is made of a large garden and also penetrating into the building, so that somehow it has this kind of dubious quality, ambiguous, of not being really the entrance to the building but leading to the entrance to the building, so that somehow the scale should relatively refer to the kind of open space that there is.

We thought we could, although this is not designed yet, we could express the end of the situation by opening window for the Board Room here on New York Avenue and also have the exhibit downstairs. Light can also penetrate from the definition of these fire exits.

The top is very plain. Obviously we have a structural system going this way (indicating) which produces the definition of this elevation over here by having the long spandrel and the column here, and there, but on the other side, we then have a structure working this way, so we think we'll have some kind of opening; at this moment the stone wall which opens up to let this sort of slot for the light into this office space up above, the rental space, and also to clarify a little bit, indicate the situation of this frontage here by these additional elements here and there (indicating).

to reduce the amount of material used in the
it is usually made a little larger, 1 1/2 inches - 2 inches
an average diameter of 1 1/2 inches. I have seen
made of a large garden hose and used for 10 years.
including, no less a person as the same kind of material.
including, of not being used in the same way.
one leading to the entrance to the building, or else
the whole should probably be the kind of
apart from these.

We thought the only way to do this was to
get the whole system the end of the situation of working
around for the whole (see also on the whole system and
have the entire system. I have seen some systems
the definition of these is not.

The way is very plain. Obviously we have a
system of pipes going into the building and out of it.
the definition of this situation over time is not the same
long period and the whole system and the whole system.
about time we have a situation where the whole system
we'll have some time of working at this point. The whole
which seems to be the whole system and the whole system.
this office should be about the whole system and the whole system.
clearly a little bit more for the situation of the whole system
part of the whole system and the whole system.

The building, as a matter of fact, is lower than what you see now. The old roof, the profile of the Lemon Building is a little higher, and has an eave which comes to this level, so we matched this height with the other building design, so that as far as color, mostly it will be a sort of dark red brown granite all through, probably a certain amount of glass, tinted glass, and the bronze of this window element, which recedes very much.

I think this section shows a certain degree of penetration of this window which just tells the story as it is.

This side is very plain. It's the side of New York Avenue now, the view of which generally comes from the top down, and by this profile, you always look into this gap.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Giurgola, has this proposal been approved by the Building Committee of the A.I.A.?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The building would be somewhat the color of the Ford Foundation.

MR. GIURGOLA: Somewhat, yes.

More or less, yes. We didn't make a study of it --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But in that range.

MR. MILLS: I would like to comment on your last question. The Committee met with the architects about two

weeks ago, the plan was established, and elevation was in process. We actually have not seen this at all.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh!

MR. MILLS: So we haven't had a chance -- we gave him a direction.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is quite different, yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Who does approve the whole design in the end for A.I.A.? The Building Committee?

MR. MILLS: Building Committee and the Board of the Institute.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They have not approved what we are looking at.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I see. We always have to know in every building what stage it's in.

MR. MILLS: Well, because of time, basically, and getting things ready for this meeting, we met with them as late as we could, but we had not actually -- they've not actually seen these drawings.

MR. GIURGOLA: This is true.

We always have the dilemma of the scale of a normal office space on top, on the upper part, which has movable partitions and so forth; and the lower part which instead has a variety of use, because of having an auditorium below, board room.

And there are lounges, and so forth. So we need to distribute the public up in the rental office.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where do people go who go to the office building? Where they enter? Not A.I.A., but the office building.

MR. GIURGOLA: In the same way.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And they leave from the ground floor, these are stairs you're talking about, for A.I.A.?

MR. MILLS: No, the central foyer is also a public lobby for the rental space. On occasions where you might have a big reception and the lobby on the first floor is used and all the exhibit space is filled with sort of Institute people, rental tenants could get out on the second floor. It is an escape for that type of situation.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I see. Do you have a typical floor of the three floors? I think it's behind there somewhere.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gentlemen, I have asked Mr. Sasaki to preside over the rest of the hearing. I unfortunately have a command date I have to go and keep, but we are still studying and Mr. Sasaki will preside.

MR. SASAKI: I'll preside with an iron hand.

(Laughter)

(Chairman Walton withdrew from the Conference Room.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: What is the purpose of the light well on those three office floors?

MR. GIURGOLA: In relation with the office floor there is no real purpose, except that we want to make this entrance this way with a --

MR. BUNSHAFT: It is for the lower levels.

MR. MILLS: It is also true that the space that is rental is contemplated as being ultimate Institute space. In other words, the size of this building is sized to take care ultimately of A.I.A. only.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's an architectural aesthetic thing.

MR. GIURGOLA: Right. Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's a square up above, an octagonal sort of below. How big is it up above?

MR. GIURGOLA: 40 by 40.

MR. BUNSHAFT: About 70 or 80 feet high?

MR. GIURGOLA: A little less than 70. This also produces something of a problem in terms of rental space. If someone wants to go on the other side, in other words it reduces to a certain extent the flexibility of the two, but --

MR. SASAKI: Mrs. Smith, have you any questions you would like to ask?

MRS. SMITH: Well, this is a plan that needs study.

These windows on the elevation under the plan here, the slit window, does that occur any place else?

MR. GIURGOLA: No, this does not occur anywhere else for the moment, just in the end of this building.

MRS. SMITH: The triangle above, as it gets used on up, you know, is it an office on the typical floors?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes, that will have some uses; that will be somehow adapted.

MRS. SMITH: To triangular people.

One thing on this plan I've not quite understood is where the glass comes back in.

MR. GIURGOLA: Well, you see what happens is that from the lower floor, the edge of the building, the lower half is here (indicating) which will be down here, and there is a connection with the auditorium, so people can also come out here. On the upper floor, it's here along this line, and then in the upper floor again it is here where there are two rooms, rooms of the President and the Vice President.

MRS. SMITH: Then the next three floors go clear up to the top?

MR. GIURGOLA: That's right, they go straight. The dilemma we feel of this building is that it is not a free-standing building and has all this kind of spaces which

sort of try to dissolve the strength of something that is self-strengthened. That's what we try to do.

MRS. SMITH: Do you have a model of that?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes, we have a model but of course we have to work on it until we have --

What we're really convinced of is this elevation and basically the general structure of this elevation, too (indicating).

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Giurgola, you said you would like to study some of those more now. How far along are you? Is this fairly well fixed?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes, in terms of proportion it is fairly well fixed.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Do you have a fundamental different approach than, say, some of the members of this Commission? Can you go back to the floor plan, the typical floor? Take those three floors. I guess the top plan on the right represents about three floors.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Just all the forms there are aesthetic sculptural forms; they have nothing to do with offices. If somebody wanted to put offices in there, I don't know what they'd do, unless it's all going to be big clericals. That end wall at the top -- how do you --

sort of an alternative for people of moderate view.

MR. BUSHNETT: That's good. I'll be glad to hear that.

MR. BUSHNETT: Do you have a word to say?

MR. BUSHNETT: Yes, I have a word to say.

We have to work on it until we have.

What he's really concerned is to get the situation

and basically the general situation is not satisfactory.

So (indicating).

MR. BUSHNETT: Yes, I think you said you would

like to study some of these more now, and far along the

you're in and fairly well fixed?

MR. BUSHNETT: Yes, in some of the areas in it.

Fairly well fixed.

MR. BUSHNETT: So you have a suggestion for the

questionnaire, yes, I have a few questions of this kind.

And you go back to the first point, the first point.

Then there's some more. I guess the way to go on.

Some suggestions about the first.

MR. BUSHNETT: Yes.

MR. BUSHNETT: Just all the things that are

not really satisfactory to me, I'm not sure if it will

show. It's not really a good thing in itself.

I don't know what you're doing, unless it's all right to me.

MR. BUSHNETT: That's all right. I'll be glad to hear that.

MR. GIURGOLA: Well, we have a span of about 50 feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, I'm not talking span, I'm talking about the vulgar thing of putting in 15 by 15 offices, if somebody rents that space. You are going at right angles, I suppose, to outside walls, but what happens at each end? I'm not saying I'm an authority to know whether it's good or bad, but it's all done on the sculptural, aesthetic quality, not on use. Unfortunately, office space is a boring thing, but I suppose the A.I.A. can forget about that. I mean it's pure sculpture. The whole building is a sculptural concept. Good or bad, I'm not the judge. I just wanted to point that out, it's a sculptural approach always, rather than a use approach.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes. Well, this we felt was in keeping with the theme of having a play and garden and all these different functions.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Just curious.

MR. GIURGOLA: We felt within that, we could organize a certain flexibility into these two things. I would agree with you this part over here (indicating) is more questionable in these terms, but already on these two sides -- and we try with the elevation to reflect this kind of continuity on these two floors.

MR. SASAKI: Ted? Questions?

MR. ROSZAK: Well, yes. Mr. Bunshaft said something about your free-wheeling approach --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I didn't say "free-wheeling."

MR. ROSZAK: Well, you did -- an aesthetic kind of innovation. Now, even in those terms, I mean I am curious, even if one were to look at it from a visual point of view -- you spoke about this opening up, you know -- if one were to look at it purely sculpturally, that is a kind of modernistic platitude. I mean how do you justify something like that?

MR. GIURGOLA: I don't know. We just had a notion, probably -- if you want to find the rationale behind it -- the light comes from the ceiling here, we contain that a little more and open up the lower part where the garden is. There's this garden and we can't turn it back to this garden. I mean we have to live with it, and we try to have all this implication within this open space which we relate inside with a particular situation outdoors, and in order to do that you have to make a transition. You can't just dump it. This is a small building. It is not a big building, and it is even lower than the Lemon Building. You don't have the sort of stepping up the Lemon Building has. Then really the strength of the garden works more into the building because of that; otherwise, it just

MR. STANLEY: (Sighs)

about your free-wheeling tendency --

MR. STANLEY: I didn't say "free-wheeling"

MR. STANLEY: Well, -- on that -- or otherwise

kind of innovation. Now, even in this case, I mean,

in various, even if one were to look at it from a purely

of view -- on some other side looking up, you know --

it now were to look at it from a different point of view

a kind of mechanical solution. I said how do you really

possessing this thing

MR. STANLEY: I don't know, we have a very

probably -- if you want to find the solution, maybe it

the right answer from the bottom line, or perhaps that

a little more and more on the other side where you

are. That's the question and we have to look at it

perhaps. I mean we have to live with it and we have to

have all our limitations with this one, and with

these things with a particular solution in mind, and

perhaps in the end you have to have a solution -- and you

just have it. That's a real solution. It's not a

building, and it's not lower than the other building

You don't have the right of solution in the other building

well, then really the solution is the same as the

into the building because of that, perhaps, it

becomes an edge, for which the life inside doesn't have anything to do with that garden in particular, except opening a window.

Well, we found from there this kind of suggestion to be sculptural, perhaps, as you say. I don't like the idea of being sculpture per se, because we have a multitude of functions here, which imply this kind of stepping in and out because of the exhibit over here and because of the sort of mixed use of the entrance, too; the auditorium, board room, conference room, and lounges, and all these kinds of interchanges which exist between this part which make it plastic and sculpture somehow.

It is not a matter of opening a door and getting out, so that all of these things that you see, a reflection of what happens on this level (indicating), which would be shaded. You know, trees are fantastic, during the summer; even in the winter. It's one of those places. Even in the winter it's full of trees here, so the same thing that happened below starts to move up and this just makes a choice of one thing up above and one thing down below.

We tried many kinds of elevations, as Mr. Mills knows, about this elevation here, yet we resolved in reducing this trend to very simple architecture by making this rather consistent module and leaving this opening clear, where this particular function happened.

becomes an edge, for which the ill-labeled door - and say
thing to do with that problem is complicated, and in essence a
window.

Well, as I said from last time, this kind of situation
to be - structural, perhaps, as you say. I don't like the
idea of being a situation for me, because as I say, a situation
of immediate facts, which imply this kind of structure in any
out course of the world's own facts and beyond of the self
of mixed use of the sentence. For the structural, word
room, conference room, and lounge, and all these things
of distances which exist between this and that, and
is plastic and sculpture together.

It is not a matter of opening a door and getting
out, so that all of these things that I say, a situation
of what happens on this level (landscaping), which would be
shaded, you know, right and left, during the
summer, even in the winter. It's one of those things
even in the winter it's full of light, and so the same
chilly that happens near water to some of the same
about a choice of one thing or another and that's how it
we tried many kinds of situations, as it is
know, about this situation here, you see, I'm not in control
this time to say about this situation, because this is
constant motion and living, this is not a static, static
this particular function together.

MR. SASAKI: Gordon.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am going to be honest, not polie, just among ourselves. I think myself the idea of having three office floors, you know, very clearly stated, is fine. I think it's fine to have a very sculptural playfulness of the specialities of the A.I.A, you know, just like you have, but I think that court -- I think you have too many motives in a small building, you have too many tricks going on, and I think they are defeating each other. I think myself that court -- have you built a model of that thing, a study model?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It must be a very strange thing interior-wise, coming down from a square to an octagon with slots going up. I visualize it as strange. It may be beautiful. You've got the study model.

Offhand--this has nothing to do with what this Commiasion is going to do, but my own personal thing is I think the height, mass, changing level to differentiate the old garden from the new is all perfect, but I think you have too many tricks in it for such a little building.

You know, each cook is different. I'm just talking about how I'd go. I think the garden level, those two levels you know, getting in and out, doing whatever you like, is exciting, especially in relation to trees and all

MR. GORDON: Yes.

MR. GORDON: I am going to be honest with

you, just among ourselves. I think myself one of

of having some better things, you know, very little

of it. I think it's time to have a very good

thing, those of the specialists in the U.S. and now,

just like you have, but I think that's all -- I think you

have got many more in a better position, you have got

many things going on, and I think they are holding you

back. I think myself that's all -- have you said it

much of this thing, a very much?

MR. GORDON: Yes.

MR. GORDON: It must be a very serious thing

interior with, coming down from a system to an exterior

with these other things. I visualize it as a system, it may

be beautiful. You've got the same model.

Offhand--into the world to be with some kind

of a thing, it's going to be, but my own personal thing is

I think the best, most, changing level to the

and the other from the way it is, and I think

you have the way, it's in the way a little bit

You know, each one is different. I'm just talking

about how I'd see. I think the other level, each one

level, you know, getting in the way, doing whatever you

like, it's something, especially in relation to the way you

that, but I think the motif of trying to take that horizontal playfulness and shove it up in that corner is a pretty tough thing to do. I don't know. I think there are just too many -- but of course you live this way and think this way so I must sound like some old fart -- excuse me -- but that's an honest criticism, and I think there's a feeling here amongst some of us of what I have said.

We know you are trying hard, and we know you have been through your first love, which you had to give up and you are trying to keep enthusiastic, and you have all these cooks giving you advice, not to mention, I suppose, the A.I.A., but we are bad enough. I don't know what the answer is, but I just thought I would tell you what I feel.

Again this does not represent the Fine Arts. There are seven members most of the time. We have talked about this before you came, you know; it's nice to understand the plan a little better, but you know we can read drawings.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Might as well get off the other thing. I think myself, making a red building -- once Sasaki made a very good speech, I thought, and that was that if this is in the mass of the buildings around the neighborhood, it probably should not be red, and the only red thing ought to be the little thing. I can't quite visualize red granite being harmonious with red brick.

It's bound to be, you know, a different kind of animal.

I just throw this out, maybe it ought to conform with the grays of the buildings around and the only little red thing be -- I just suggest this -- I don't suggest it, I'm just talking out loud to myself -- the little old building stay in red brick, and you know, trying to get two reds in two different materials is sometimes pretty difficult.

I just throw that out.

MR. GIURGOLA: I appreciate your criticism about these (indicating drawings). This changing that you see probably will go in the process, because still you see the work has been carried -- we have a model, apparently we have a model twice the scale of this one, but we just left the plain thing inside yet.

We never played around with all these different levels, and also their changing is only happening on the very bottom, this kind of octagon which sort of made some connection here, but, well --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Oh, it only occurs on one level?

MR. GIURGOLA: One level, yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: From there on in, it's square?

MR. GIURGOLA: Always square, yes. Probably would be all enclosed, a straight shaft.

MR. GIURGOLA: Well, you walk over here and you are

It's common to say you know a different kind of thing.

I guess from that fact, since it means to compare with the

state of the world, it means the only thing that

could be -- I guess maybe that -- I don't know if it's

just saying out loud to myself in the first and second

step in the first, and you know, saying to you

that in two different situations as compared to the first

I guess that's all.

MR. CHURCHMAN: I understand your criticism about

these (indicating drawings). (The speaker then says)

probably will go in the process, because still you see two

not, but again saying -- it says a model, especially in

have a model with the state of this one, and we give it to

the thing which you

We never say that with all these different

levels, and also that change is also happening to the

very much, this kind of change which state of

some connection here, but, well --

MR. CHURCHMAN: It is only a matter of time

MR. CHURCHMAN: The level is

MR. CHURCHMAN: From time to time it's

MR. CHURCHMAN: Always again, that's

which is all included in the first

MR. CHURCHMAN: Well, you can't say that

still walking under a two-story element.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think any sort of playfulness on those two levels is fine. As you point out very well, the A.I.A. is a series of special rooms you can do anything with, but God damn, when you get up to office floors, it's tough. You are avoiding the tough part getting an office building to work as an office. Unfortunately, it's boring as all hell. I hate office buildings because of that.

MR. SASAKI: Gordon, may I ask you a question. You speak of internal forces influencing the shape of the building, but also wouldn't there be external forces? As Mr. Giurgola said, shaping of walls around the garden, now, would that be valid?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Playfulness of the first two floors.

MR. SASAKI: No, I mean the end walls.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That wall on the top is a sculptural thing, and Mr. Giurgola would like to break it up. As long as you don't have to work inside, it is fine.

MR. SASAKI: Well, as I say, you can store -- to some extent, you're quite right. Each of us designs differently, but here where this turns in and this place comes out, and I think Mrs. Smith had the question why the triangle, but the triangle works from the inside as well as this side, the entrance which I think looks rather

I just asked the question. There are many ways to design, so maybe that is his view. I am making a statement in asking you whether that's the reason for it.

MR. GIURGOLA: I would just like to say one thing. I think all this comes from the fact we always have this situation. We come into and under these two stories, and then we asked can we have an anticlimax like that by entering in the contrast with the garden and finding you're in a lobby which is low or keep repeating and then from a certain point on you say well, then I started office space, so we found the only element and maybe now it is not simple enough, of the reunion --

MR. BUNSHAFT: That lobby could be two stories high. It does not have to penetrate through the office. There are other approaches. I am not advocating anything, I am just saying I think you're making life pretty complicated with this corner. I have a feeling it ought to be separated even more or something, to really make a strong statement.

MR. SASAKI; It seems to me there is some validity in this desire to integrate the upper floor with the lower floor, as Mr. Mills said eventually when the A.I.A. moves into the whole building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So you have to have a shaft through

the whole God damn thing to be integrated?

MR. SASAKI: I was thinking of some of the old buildings which had a grand stairwell to the whole building. It relieved the plain office part.

MR. GIURGOLA: It is a very difficult thing to have a building that turns a corner like that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You said it! You're making a feature of it, and I think the plain fact is you're not solving it too well. Maybe the best thing is to let it die. I don't know.

MR. GIURGOLA: We always had this uncomfortable situation of this welding and not making it more clear. One is one thing and the other is another.

MR. SASAKI; I want to make sure everyone has an opportunity to ask all the questions he wants.

Mrs. Smith, do you want to ask some questions?

MRS. SMITH: No, I would just terribly like to see a model.

MR. MILLS: I would like to express a little bit the feeling of the Committee that is working with the architect on this.

Number one, the architect tried several sort of camouflage treatments, you might say, of this internal space to overcome the previous criticism of horizontality, and that was tried, and everything that was tried we were very

lukewarm with, because it seemed to be a very phony kind of expression, and we felt quite strongly that you do have a mix here of Institute space and office space, which will be rental, and later on becomes office space for the Institute, so ultimately there will be one occupancy.

However, in trying to express those office floors, we felt that the direct way to do it was something similar to this which you are expressing, expressing them exactly the way they are. We did feel that the central foyer, our criticism was quite similar to some of the comments made here, that we'd like to either open it up more so it became more of a feature of the exterior, rather than being sort of squeezed in with a sort of slot between.

We did suggest that the office floors be treated with this modern arrangement that could be used for other purposes, to also break up this strong horizontality and express also what is really happening.

Now I'd like to ask the Commission if they feel that within the very broad ideas that have been started, if a development that perhaps simplified these a little bit more, whether you feel that we are on a track here that will bring about approval and a satisfactory building. I think we all feel, for instance, that the entrance on New York Avenue under this high overhang is a suitable entrance to go into the garden; to climax that high foyer is somewhat

involvement with, because it seems to be a very simple and
of experience, and no real sense of things and to the
a bit more of interest, and a little more of the
no real, and a little more of the
conclusion, the ultimately good will be the same.

however, in order to make the best of it.

we will have the direct way to it, and a somewhat similar
to this which you are concerned, examining some of the
way they are, as did (and that the central point, and
or other way which is also a part of the same thing.
more, that will be like to be a part of the same thing.
none of the things of the world, and a little more of
as appeared in with a part of the world.

we will suggest that the direct way to it.

with this modern arrangement, but could be used in a
purpose, to show that the same thing is the same thing.
copies that are in the world.

now it's time to go to the conclusion of the world.

that within the very same time, and a little more of the
a different way, and a little more of the
more, whether you want to go to a place, and a little
what about the world, and a little more of the
we all feel, for instance, that the world is the same.

and we all feel, for instance, that the world is the same.

questionable, partly because of cost and also its expression outside, but the expression of the office floors being what they are, expression of the Institute's space being what it is, and the entrance over New York Avenue is what we have felt was sort of the basis of our encouragement to the architect to proceed.

The fact we have not seen these does not mean we would not approve them but they'd be a brand new expression of what we have seen; what we saw before this was merely studies, but I would like to, if we can, get a basis from which we can work and if this general basis, size, the general idea of expressing the office floors is such, and the recession, the in-and-out treatment of the Institute space is satisfactory, I think that that at least is a point from which I think we can work with them and develop something that will be approved.

Now, am I correct in that? Do you think I am correct?

MR. SASAKI; Well, Mr. Mills, I think the Commission, as you know, is composed of individual members and each has his own ideas, so I don't think any one of us can speak for the Commission in total.

MR. MILLS: I realize that.

MR. SASAKI: Because we have not really discussed this or taken a vote on this yet. We think it's proper to

wait until Mr. Walton comes back from a meeting, and then we'll take this up this afternoon again.

I think the Commission members reached agreement in general on mass, the height --

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I interrupt? I gather you are not asking us to approve this as a total design? I thought what you just stated was very clear. You are asking us to approve general principles, fenestration of the office thing, mass, entrance, and so on?

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You yourself are going to think about and study this corner treatment?

MR. MILLS: That's right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think that is very good; it's not a yes or no at this stage, it's sort of participating along in its evolution is what you are asking.

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think that is a very important point to understand, and it makes it much simpler. In other words, you are really asking three things, I think: the general scheme of the offices, the mass, and treatment, shall we say, of the fenestration of the office thing, general treatment of the main entrance, the general blankness of the other corner, and I suppose the terraces, and you're saying,

I think, that you and the architects want to study a little more this connection, corner treatment and lobby, and whole notch; is that what you are saying?

MR. MILLS: I think that's about it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's what I thought you said. If that's it, you'd like comments from us on progress of development.

MR. MILLS: In other words, if we are really on the wrong track, completely, we'd like to know it now.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think that is a very clear statement.

MR. SASAKI: This is exactly the point we're at and if you are asking for total approval, we are not ready for it yet.

MR. SCHEICK: When we come in with the final presentation, if we're there and know enough of your senses and feelings about this architect and all of us together, we can come in and don't run into what we ran into last June.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think next time you ought to come with whoever is the owner and say this is what they want.

MR. MILLS: That's right.

MR. SASAKI: I think this would be a very good stopping point. We can report to Mr. Walton when he comes

back, the general discussion.

We would entertain any comments from your side, too. Does anyone else want to make a statement?

MR. SCHEICK: Would your report to us and written opinion give us some of the thinking?

MR. SASAKI: Yes, I think it is in the record here, so we can make a summary from the transcript to give to you.

MR. SCHEICK: What would be your reaction had this been shown to you all in brick?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think we can get a unanimous thing here.

MR. MILLS: One of the real problems here, as I see it, is we are trying to get some connection between this building and the Octagon. You can see that on the 18th Street elevation. If this is a white building, what do you make that connection out of?

MR. BUNSHAFT: What connection?

MR. MILLS: These things that are sort of enclosing this whole thing (indicating on sketch). As you know, the architect originally started out with brick, and there were some fairly discouraging comments on the basis that brick-it wasn't early a brick technology, let's say, but I think many of the Committee and the architects think of brick as a veneer, just as much as granite can be a veneer, and it might well be that a brick building wouldn't do what you are

Dear, and mutual friendship.

We would certainly be pleased that you should

have been taken into our confidence.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

My dear friend, I am very glad to hear

that you are well and happy.

talking about, continuing the gray of Washington but would be an enclosing element of the entire space. I'd like to know what the general feeling is.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If you were left alone without clients and Fine Arts Commission, Mr. Giurgola, what would you make it of?

MR. GIURGOLA: Granite. I think the building we had before was not brick for the simple reason we had only a very simple system of wall at this end, and this end, (indicating) and inside it was only granite and glass, so pretty obviously one could think in terms of having these two end walls in brick and there was that spandrel on top which was the questionable part of it. But now that we have this large opening, we feel much convinced it should be granite because again there should be this kind of plasticity there is inside, sculptural effect; it's a counterpart of the very smoothness of the building itself.

MR. SASAKI; If you are looking for brick to integrate the wall, and so forth, could this line (indicating) be brick here which then would give you this unit? If I were to express an opinion -- this isn't the Fine Arts Commission -- we're all on our own -- if you have a building this large of brick, you suffer the same sort of situation where the very tall buildings on Lafayette Square are in brick and it does not really relate to the small thing.

By sheer bulk it relates to the larger building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is a concrete building, and if you wanted to be real tough, you'd do it in concrete; if you want to be fancy, you would cover it with granite. It is not a brick building and could never look like one.

MR. GIURGOLA: My feeling is brick is valid only when you have a large surface, so that the bricks disappear and remain a color.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, no, this is not a brick building.

MR. GIURGOLA: When you have a description of window, and so on.

MR. SCHEICK: I think we have a good, positive answer to that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: My own decision would be to make the whole building a poured-in-place concrete building and really get a vigorous -- that's what I thought you would say.

MR. SCHEICK: The discussion we had that I took part in, in the office just a short time ago, I was saying I felt there were three essential elements to this design; that one was, and this is regardless of material, particularly as the landscape has developed here, where trees become quite important, as I visualize this, a very important feature

is being under trees, with this very lively two-story element thing, a very delightful thing with the garden. Yet that is set in, inside. This is what you live with when you walk into the area, and as you pointed out, Mr. Bunshaft, these first two floors are really the A.I.A. Above that is office. Then the unity of scale and mass seen from the street is what most of the people will have the impression of, so that the third element, perhaps the most important one, is simply those office floors. With the design and interest of these other two major elements that you hope to achieve, that what happens up here is separate, some background above that and not one of the things you have to struggle with most completely, so I am interested in what Mr. Bunshaft said about this thing (indicating in sketch), although we may have very practical reasons not to use that space above the second floor.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think on that you better have a meeting of your own. That is why we asked the question. The owner ought to settle with the architect. The architect can't be let loose among all these committees. Holy God!

Well, we are certainly agreed it should not be brick.

MR. SCHEICK: I heard Mr. Sasaki talking about brick walls and garden paving.

MR. MILLS: He was talking about something very low.

MR. SCHEICK: Talking about something on a very low plane, aren't you?

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, he is talking about the existing brick there, that's brick walls. Here's the logical termination (indicating). That brick wall comes around this space. I would not mind seeing that brick on a terrace; that would be fine. Now it seems to me you are thinking of material here, and this could be granite of a rosy tinge. From the middle range of value it need not go to the darker side, but could go to the lighter side, so this would not stand as a big, strong, dark value, amidst a little value, but still there could be harmony.

I haven't seen any pink concrete, have you?
It couldn't be pink.

MR. GIURGOLA: Not pink, no.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Gray.

MR. GIURGOLA: I think we can achieve a surface that could be very, very good.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It could be a rich gray but not red. I personally think this building -- I think that's one of the best things, you know, that Sasaki said in four years when he said that mass should tie in with that mass around there, and this thing ought to stand out as a piece of red sculpture.

I personally think you've got a design that when you get the costs, it will be concrete.

(Laughter)

MR. BUNSHAFT: It looks like a concrete thing.

I think all these joints in concrete and great big piers will look funny. We went through the same thing with the Air Museum, came in with tremendous piers, all veneered. We said, "Why don't you pour them in really big concrete so it will look like something?"

MR. GIURGOLA: I'd be ready to do it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: A concrete design, no question about it.

MR. MILLS: Yes, that is the direct thing to do.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And those little walls can come up just like the steps and stop somewhere with a gate between them or some damn thing.

I think when you are talking about granite, you either get pale pink or Ford Foundation. There aren't many subtle shades. The Ford Foundation would be a rather gloomy kind of thing behind this little red thing.

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes, I'm all for it. I think I can fight for the concrete.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I mean concrete with good granite aggregate, something really done well. You know -- strong.

I personally think you've got a double fault on

you for the court, it will be covered.

(Laughter)

MR. BUSHNETT: It looks like a double fault.

I think all these points in between the great big sides
will look okay. We want between the two things with the
the museum, come in with something that all visitors
we said, "Why don't you have them in really big concrete so
it will look like something."

MR. GURDOL: I'd be ready to do it.

MR. BUSHNETT: A concrete design, no question

about it.

MR. WILSON: Yes, that is the right thing to do.

MR. BUSHNETT: And these little walls can come in

that like the other and they something with a gate between

them or just plain solid.

I think when you are talking about things, you

always get into the old-fashioned. There are a

many things there. The first something would be a gate

along kind of like the old-fashioned thing.

MR. GURDOL: Yes, that's the idea. I think it's

right for the concrete.

MR. BUSHNETT: I want concrete (it) not stone.

Something, something really good. The way - stone

I don't know if you'd use exposed plywood here, would you?

MR. GIURGOLA: We use plywood for smooth surfaces.

MRS. SMITH: I think the elegance of concrete in the Hancock Building in San Francisco is the most handsome concrete I've seen.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is a concrete design, no question about it.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Giurgola, do you think you have received ideas from the Commission?

MR. GIURGOLA: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: So I think unless there are any other comments, we ought to call it quits. We will report to Mr. Walton and give you a reply.

MR. MILLS: Yes, I think it's been very helpful.

(Whereupon, at 12:55 p.m. the meeting was adjourned, to be reconvened at 2:30 p.m. the same day.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That completes our agenda. We'll go into an educational session.

What did you do with the A.I.A.?

MR. SASAKI: To sum it up very quickly, we found out they were submitting their plans, designs for final approval, anyway. They wanted just a progress reaction, so we gave our blessing on the general massing, general treatment, articulation of the office area from the A.I.A. area.

They in turn will go back and restudy the fenestration, using all concrete instead of granite facing and integrate the building more as one piece.

In a nutshell, it seems as though they were of the same mind as we were.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Were they? That's great.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The first thing is this -- this plan did not represent the approval of the whole building committee or the board. They hadn't seen the elevations we saw, and they asked whether we would agree and we said we couldn't say until after we had all met, whether we agreed to the general principles of this end elevation, agreed to the general fenestration of the office portion, and in the general direction.

We said, you know, that each person has his own thing but we had a lot of discussion on this well going up through all the floors, and they brought up the question

they weren't sure they wanted it, and old Giurgola turned green. Of course the thing doesn't work when you get up there. It's very nice that they ought to be charming and tolerant of an architect, but all those shapes in the upper floors -- I'd hate to lay out offices there. There isn't a thing at right angles anywhere.

I said he had too many motifs. We agreed on the idea of three floors of offices, and then sort of sculptural effect of the architectural school is fine, makes sense, but then he introduces this other motif and all these tricky things.

They asked us about materials. He was talking dark granite, really talking of the Ford Foundation, real dark granite and some of these fellows asked what about brick, and we said this was a concrete design building and I asked Giurgola what he would like if he were left alone. He said granite. I said, "I'm surprised. I would have thought you would like a real concrete building," and about ten minutes later he said if he had his way, he would like concrete -- because that's what it is -- and it was left that we would let them know whether we agreed to the general fenestration, the three office floors, whether we agreed to this kind of end elevation, this question of the new kind of little windows here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think that's one of the worst, that end.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You know, if somebody wanted to get sculptural, you could make a case that you come in -- he has two entrances here -- you know with a great big wall here, which he draws rather lightly. That's the big thing. Then this motif (indicating on drawing) and here another motif. This is supposed to be all bronze color, so this horizontal piece of metal --

MR. SASAKI: I think what they want is general approval of the treatment of this area (indicating on drawing), the notion of the terrace, notion of articulating this with the two-story section and that. They didn't ask for approval of these elevations because he said he wanted to study this more, so I don't think we have to mention elevations.

MRS. SMITH: Then we talked about a model because the courtyard is very complex.

MR. SASAKI: I think we came through with a general statement saying we approved the general site plan, general massing, articulation of the upper level and level below and let it go at that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right. Do you agree to that, Gordon?

MR. BUNSHAFT: In a malicious way, yes, I think we are just slipping into approving a half-baked thing, but

that's all right. We can't change Giurgola. If I were him, I think I'd quit. He turned green because in the midst of this thing, the A.I.A. fellows started mentioning things they didn't like.

MR. SASAKI: Would you also like to mention we suggested they study the building in concrete?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we ought to leave it to the architect to do what they want.

MR. SASAKI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If we have no other business --

MRS. SMITH: I want to bring up one thing, that's 14th Street, 7th Street, and the whole bit. I think you should talk to Walter Washington and say these are important areas of the city, and that the Commission stands ready to participate at this moment in time; and then that we find a position and recommend because they are going to do things, you know, fast; and all this very important part of the city --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Does this come under the Fine Arts Commission?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No.

MRS. SMITH: Well, parts of it do -- the schools.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But I think it is a perfectly legitimate action for this Commission to take -- to offer

3 May 1968

Dear Mr. Blaser:

This is to confirm the Commission of Fine Arts' April 17th request for restudy of the Capitol East Playground and Natatorium. We recommend a simplification of the massing and a clearer expression of the design program, i.e. light, open and inviting in character.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. James A. Blaser
Director
D.C. Department of Buildings
and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT L

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
17 April 1968

AM
9:30

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting:
Executive Session: 14 May 1968
Open Session: 15 May 1968
2. Approval of Minutes of February 1968 Meeting
3. Joint NCPC-CFA Committee on Landmarks - Confirmation of
Previous Approval *-Proposed List for National Register*

III. LEGISLATION

1. S. 2970-2/15/68-Mr. Pearson-90th C

To establish an independent Office of Government Procedure to assist the Congress in its oversight of the execution of statutes enacted by the Congress, the evaluation of procedures of executive and independent agencies of the Government, and the adoption of improved means to carry into effect the policies of the Congress.

2. H.R. 15859-3/11/68-Mr. Pepper-90th C

To require that at least 1 per centum of the money available to construct Federal buildings shall be used to provide for decoration and beautification in such buildings.

IV. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

- a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington
- b. Proposed Building Across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks
- c. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building - Proposed Design

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

- a. Child Research Center, National Institutes of Health - Proposed Design
- b. Howard University Teaching Hospital - Proposed Design

3. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds
Capitol East Playground and Natatorium - Revised Design
4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service
Proposed Ellipse Fountains at Constitution Avenue and 16th St., N.W.
5. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic
Center Leg of Inner Loop, Design of South Portal and Walls
6. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers
Guard Houses, Arlington National Cemetery - Proposed Design
7. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Old Georgetown Act
 - a. Appendix 2
 - b. O.G. 68-170, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W.-Heating and Cooling Plant, Georgetown University - Revised site plan and designShipstead-Luce Act
 - a. Appendix 1
 - b. S.W. Communications Center, South Capitol and E Sts., S.W. - Revised Design
 - c. American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

V. INTERVIEWS

- 12:00 1. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections
American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

LUNCH

- 2:30 2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
 - a. Proposed Development of Parcels 19 and 20 in Southwest Washington
 - b. Proposed Building Across Maryland Avenue Railroad Tracks

c. L'Enfant Plaza, West Building - Proposed Design

3:00 3. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Child Research Center, National Institutes of Health -
Proposed Design

b. Howard University Teaching Hospital - Proposed Design

3:30 4. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Center Leg of Inner Loop, Design of South Portal and Walls

3:45 5. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Capitol East Playground and Natatorium - Revised Design

4:00 6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Southwest Communications Center - Revised Design

